DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 964 JC 740 336

AUTHOR Masiko, Peter; And Others
TITLE Testimony on Vocational Education for the General Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 13 Aug 74
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; *Community Colleges; Delivery Systems; *Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; Federal State Relationship; *Junior Colleges; Post Secondary Education; Speeches; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Testimony of the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and of representatives of the junior and community college movement as to the role of these colleges in vocational education is presented. The testimony is comprised of the following: statement by Dr. Peter Masiko--Introduction, Background, Comments on Implementation of Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and Problem Areas and Concerns (State Administration of Postsecondary Occupational Education, Relevant Vocational Education Emphasis, Adequate Program Guidance, and Federal Administration of Programs); supplemental testimony by: Dr. J. Harry Smith (occupational education programs and services to the disadvantaged and handicapped), Dr. John Grede (program authorizations, work experience programs, authority for contracting and cooperative agreements, occupational education services, and special projects for improvement), Mr. M Dale Ensign (cooperative education programs), and Ambassador John Mundt (appeals procedures, state advisory councils, local advisory councils, state administration: the Washington State Model); an additional statement by Dr. J. Harry Smith (summary of recommendations); concluding comments by Dr. Masiko; and a list of exhibits. (DB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 095964

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Testimony
on
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
for the

General Subcommittee on Education
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
United States House of Representatives

by
Dr. Peter Masiko
President - Miami-Dade Community College
Chairman - AACJC Board of Directors

and

Members of the AACJC Commission on Governmental Affairs

Dr. J. Harry Smith
President, Essex County (New Jersey)
Community College

John C. Mundt
Director, Washington State Board
for Community College Education

M. Dale Ensign
Vice President - Husky Oil Company
Former President - Association of Community College Trustees
Former Chairman - Wyoming Advisory Board for Vocational Education
Member - AACJC Board of Directors

and

Dr. John F. Grede
Vice Chancellor - Career and Manpower Programs
City Colleges of Chicago
Chairman - National Council on Occupational Education

JC 740 336

August 13, 1974

CONTENTS

TESTIMONY	PAGE
Dr. Peter Masiko, President Miami-Dade Community College	1
Dr. J. Harry Smith, President Essex County (N.J.) Community College	12
Dr. John F. Grede, Vice-Chancellor City Colleges of Chicago	15
Mr. M. Dale Ensign, Vice President Husky Oil Company	22
Mr. John C. Mundt, Director Washington State Board for Community College Education	24
Summary - Dr. Smith	29
Conclusion - Dr. Masiko	31
List of Exhibits - A through P	33
Commission on Governmental Affairs	34

STATEMENT

Dr. Peter Masiko, President
Miami-Dade Community College

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Peter Masiko, President of Miami-Dade Community College and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. With me are distinguished representatives of the community and junior college movement who will participate in our presentation.

We welcome the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee and thank you for the invitation. Before proceeding I want to compliment you for holding hearings as well outside Washington. We believe this can be helpful in your deliberations. With your permission we will enter our statements in the record. I will then make a brief oral presentation summarizing our concerns and recommendations, emphasizing a few major considerations. The other panel members will briefly comment on specific areas of concern.

Before presenting our observations, concerns and recommendations, I would like to explain the strong interest our association has in vocational education.

BACKGROUND

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges represents over 950 community, junior and technical colleges throughout the nation. Approximately 1140 community colleges, junior colleges, technical institutes and centers offer educational training to over approximately 3,000,000 students. For more than a decade the community college movement has been the most rapidly growing major segment of education in America.

In 1973, 44% of all community college students initially enrolled in occupational education programs. (This percentage contrasts significantly with the 13% who were enrolled in similar programs in 1965, less than ten years ago.) In many states -- Massachusetts, California, New York, Illinois, to name a few -- at least half of all initial enrollments in 1973 were in occupational programs. Students are enrolled in hundreds of different occupational education programs, ranging from short-term skill training programs to sophisticated associate degree programs in new

technologies and the health sciences. Special counseling services, learning laboratories, developmental programs and cooperative relations with business and industry support these programs.

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., President of AACJC, has commented recently on future directions for community colleges in his publication, "After the Boom...What Now for the Community Colleges." (see Tab A) He calls upon community colleges to be community-based, performance-based institutions.

He states:

> "Target populations will include a large proportion of personnel not previously found in postsecondary education. These will include persons who have been unable to continue post-high school education: adults unemployed or in jobs that are obsolete, the hard-core unemployed, women in the community including young mothers with children at home, senior citizens. The effects of serving these populations will include a rising age level, higher proportion of students from lower socioeconomic levels, and larger numbers of 'part-time' students."

As Dr. Gleazer's statement indicates, community colleges are strengthening their resolve to serve community needs through analyzing these needs and providing programs which effectively meet needs so identified. (See Tab B) As a result, the scope of community college programs and services is increasingly expanding beyond the traditional group of young people just out of high school to include the entire community.

Not at all parenthetically, I would like to offer the view that the postsecondary level of vocational education has increased in importance since 1968, and is likely to continue to do so. Among the reasons for this may be cited the declining birthrate, accompanied by a decrease in the percentage of population under the age of 18, the increasing number of occupational changes in an individual's lifetime, the occupational needs of younger retired persons and vigorous older citizens, and the numbers of adult women entering the labor force.

Additionally, a number of federal and state regulations have given impetus to the need for postsecondary, adult level, occupational training. Factors such as the increase in the minimum wage rate and coverage, minimum age for licensure in certain occupations, and the regulations under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, to name a few, favor the hiring of adult workers.

Another point to bear in mind is that training beyond high school is needed for an ever-increasing percentage of available jobs, not only to qualify for work at an entry-level, but as importantly, for job mobility as well as upgrading and promotional opportunities within a given occupation.

Compared with single-purpose postsecondary vocational schools, the

community colleges offer their students the combination of training and credit which promote educational and job mobility. Thus training undertaken at one stage in a worker's life can be built upon for further training or education, increasing his options in career development.[1]

Such training options can include short term programs for entry into specific occupations, to which further training can be added at a later time. The options can also include paraprofessional training in critical service industries, technologies, and other areas of national priority, which provide the student with background for baccalaureate degree work if this should later be deemed appropriate.

We believe community colleges have been, and will increasingly continue to be concerned and aggressively involved in responding to the occupational education needs of all people in their communities.

COMMENTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges again commends this subcommittee and its distinguished Chairman, Congressman Carl Perkins, for the significant improvements to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 which were provided in the amendments of 1968. Most college administrators and occupational staff people have welcomed and appreciated the substantial advancements made possible by Congress in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. In my view, specific improvements have included:

- Under the amendments, community colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutes experienced improvements in the flow of money for the occupational education preparation of persons of postsecondary age.

- The 15% setaside under Part B made it mandatory to spend at least a minimum proportion of V.E.A. funds on those persons no longer of high school age. In many states this minimum has been met and exceeded.

- The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education was given new responsibilities for oversight of the new educational provisions (although the required annual report on overlaps and duplication has only been done once).

- State plans for Vocational Education have been developed in all states. In many states these plans have reflected more adequately the concerns of all persons interested in a comprehensive system of vocational education, and many included community colleges.

- In many states the State Advisory Councils established pursuant

---

1. See "Articulation of Postsecondary Programs in Occupational Education," by Moore, Smith and Kurth. Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida State University, University of Florida (Tab E).

to the 1968 amendments include effective representation from community colleges and other postsecondary institutions.

- It should be added that under the Education Amendments of 1972, community colleges and postsecondary occupational education have received new recognition as important components in the total vocational education delivery system. This has been welcomed by the community colleges and is strongly supported today.

- Finally, we have been pleased to note many new experiments in cooperative planning and programming among different types of institutions concerned with the efficient and effective development of vocational education systems.

PROBLEM AREAS AND CONCERNS

Despite these promising developments, several problem areas remain which we would like to bring to the attention of the Committee.

I. Problem Area: State Administration of Postsecondary Occupational Education

The 1968 Amendments established minimum setasides to give needed emphasis to postsecondary occupational education, following a direct suggestion of the Advisory Council. The Amendments also created State Advisory Councils and required that their members include representatives of postsecondary occupational education. Hearings were mandated and appeal and review procedures were established. Further, the Amendments provided other mechanisms to improve state planning and program administration, to avoid program duplication, and promote cooperation and stimulate equitable funding distribution.

A few months ago AACJC surveyed state directors of community colleges on experience with the Vocational Education Act in their state. These comments are based on responses from 35 states, as well as a great variety of other sources.

Setasides: While the 1968 Amendments stipulated that not less than 15% of Part B vocational education funds must be used at the postsecondary level, it appears that many states view the 15% as a maximum rather than a minimum, and in ten states, less than 15% has been directed to postsecondary occupational education.

According to Office of Education Reports[1] in the following states less than 15% went to the postsecondary level in 1972.

---

1. OE Information No. V., See Tab C.

Alabama	14.7%
Alaska	12.2
Connecticut	13.8
New Hampshire	13.0
New Jersey	13.3
New York	11.6
Ohio	14.7
Rhode Island	11.0
South Carolina	11.4
Vermont	14.5
Puerto Rico	11.9

According to the same report, in the following states postsecondary vocational education funds range between 15.0% and 18.0%.

Illinois	17.6%
Indiana	15.4
Maryland	15.2
Missouri	18.0
Nevada	16.0
Oklahoma	16.9
Pennsylvania	17.9
West Virginia	15.6

Postsecondary funds in other titles of the Vocational Education Act:

Since the setaside for postsecondary relates only to Part B funds, the record of allocation of funds from other Parts has been very spotty. Many states report that the State Agency will not allocate funds under other Parts to Postsecondary Education.

According to reports in AACJC's survey of State Directors, the average postsecondary percentages in the 21 states completing this part of the form are:

Part B	20%
Part C	15
Part D	7
Part F	7
Part G	10
Part H	7
Handicapped	13
Disadvantaged	14

We would recommend that Congress consider using setasides in all parts of the legislation to give postsecondary schools equitable access to research and demonstration and the other special purposes of the Vocational Education Act.

Responsiveness of State Vocational Education Agency

The Vocational Education Act is administered in the states through a "sole state agency" which almost universally is a State Board for Vocational Education (the exact agency name varies, of course).

In our survey, we found that six states have arrangements through which a postsecondary agency is involved in the administration of programs at that level. In the other 29 states reporting, administration rests with the State Vocational Education Agency, with varying results.

Eleven states reported that there was no system, formal or informal, for coordination between the State Vocational Education Agency and the State Community College Agency. Of the 22 states reporting a "system", 12 said it was mandatory, through law or formal policy statements. In ten states voluntary coordiation is practiced, ranging from good will and interpersonal relationships through joint representation on Boards or Commissions.

Such variations in state administration help explain the different postsecondary experiences in the states, from favorable to extremely difficult. Our concern is with those situations where postsecondary schools and/or community colleges are denied their rightful access to vocational education funds.

In some states (Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Montana, as examples) relationships between state community college agencies and state vocational education agencies are strained at best.

Comments like the following indicate the college leaders' views:

> "Sole state agency systems are fine if they do not demonstrate bias toward the secondary sector. We are still viewed by the area vocational school administrators and some state vocational education staff as upstarts. There is an adversary relationship in many areas of the state."

In our survey we asked the State Directors of Community Colleges if they or individual community colleges in their states participated in vocational education planning. We found that in eleven states community college personnel do not participate. Plans are developed for them by the State Vocational Education Agency, with their input not invited, or in some cases, their requests for participation denied. Six of these states are large urban states with active community college or other postsecondary systems.

In other states there is the problem of competition between Area Vocational Schools and Community Colleges, fostering duplication and precluding effective student articulation between institutions, and creating gaps in services to persons in need of occupational education.

It appears that state vocational education agencies sometimes favor area vocational schools in the distribution of certain funds. Correspondence from a state on the Atlantic Coast emphasizes this

concern.

> "Our main concern at this time other than the distribution procedure at the state level is the question of eligibility of community colleges for the handicapped and disadvantaged portions of Part B funds.
>
> "Colleges have been discouraged from applying for these funds by the Vocational Education Division, and have never been funded out of these portions. It is our contention that the 15% of Part B which is allocated to postsecondary institutions represents a minimum and that two-year colleges should be seriously considered as contenders for funds in these areas, for vocational program development for disadvantaged and/or handicapped students.
>
> "Vocational education people have not, in the past two years, claimed that colleges are not eligible in those words, but the effect is the same. I enclose reports of distribution for the last two years to support the point."

Minnesota has a system of area vocational schools, and a system of community colleges which offer vocational courses. Almost no federal vocational education funds go to the state's community colleges. Furthermore, there seems to be little relationship between the two sets of institutions although in some cases they are located in close proximity to one another. We are told that at the individual school there are relationships between the two types of institutions but that state level relationships prevent development of effective sharing of facilities or program coordination.

Other states with area vocational schools and state community or junior college systems in which vocational edcuation funds largely go to the former include Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada and West Virginia.

The basic problem in many states seems to rest with attitudes in the state vocational education agencies whose leaders' primary experience and outlook is in secondary level vocational education. As a result the postsecondary level, and particularly colleges offering occupational education, are viewed with disdain, with alarm, or are not viewed at all.

At the national level this problem has gained wide recognition, but it is not easy to move the existing state agencies.

An October 1973 newsletter from the American Vocational Association states the problem very succinctly:

> "Although vocational education is for all people it has been too often identified as a program primarily for preparing secondary school level students for entry level employment...

"...Within the education system there are conflicts, mistrusts and power struggles between secondary and higher education institutions. Congress should address itself to this problem."

A few survey respondents volunteered another kind of comment about their relationships with state vocational education agencies. They were concerned about excessive regulation of their activities, imposed as a condition of receiving funds. Without looking into the matter more deeply we cannot be sure whether these regulations result from the state agencies' efforts to follow federal regulations and guidelines, or whether they are state agency initiatives. Later we will address the need for flexibility in vocational education. Here we offer the comment that excessive regulation and flexibility are often incompatible.

For the committee's interest I will quote from two of our survey respondents:

"Only 3% of the total budget is for federal reimbursed programs. These funds come from the vocational department with strict requirements although having no control over the institutions. Our area boards and state board of community colleges are seriously considering not claiming these funds because of these problems. These funds should be given to the state board of community colleges for distribution and control."

And another:

"The State Board for Vocational and Technical Education... provides approximately eight cents on the dollar in categorical aid, then attempts to dictate the spending of the whole dollar through prescribing all manner of standards, certification requirements, reports and the like, with the effect that the categorical tail wags the institutional dog."

State Advisory Councils: The 1968 Amendments created these councils, to evaluate vocational education programs funded under the Act, advise the State Board on state plan development, and to provide an annual evaluation report.

The Act mandates that the Council shall include a person or persons representative of community and junior colleges, area vocational schools, technical institutes, and postsecondary or adult education institutions in the state which provide occupational education programs. Despite this requirement, two respondents to our survey indicated that there were no representatives of such institutions or the State Advisory Council. The other states indicated at least one person; two states reported five representatives. However, ten state directors volunteered that community college views are not "adequately" represented on the Council.

While 10 state community college directors rated the State Advisory Councils as "effective", the Councils were given low ratings in 13 states. Explanations for low ratings often included the view that the Councils were effective for elementary and secondary vocational education, but were not effective for postsecondary. Some state directors felt that the Councils simply had little impact on the course of vocational education in their state, or that they were viewed by the State Vocational Education Agency as a necessary evil.

We would recommend that the Congress require that more than one representative from community college postsecondary occupational education sit on each State Advisory Council. Since we believe that this level of training is very important and will become more important in future years, a stronger voice in state policy direction is obviously needed.

Appeal and Review Procedures: The 1968 Amendments mandate public hearings on the state vocational education plan and set up an appeals process.

In general, the respondents to our survey indicated that the hearings were of little effect in state plan development.

There are indications that in a few instances adequate public notice of hearings is not given, or that the mailing list for notice of hearings has important gaps, resulting in lack of notification of impending hearings.

However, a more important problem seems to be in the lack of effectiveness of the hearings: in our survey 18 states rated them "ineffective". Generally, the reasons given for calling the hearings ineffective fall into two categories:

1) Postsecondary spokesmen have no impact at the hearings and see no state plan changes resulting from their effort;

2) More broadly, the state plan is not impacted in any way as a result of hearings; they are 'rubber stamp' exercises.

Appeals procedures outlined in the 1968 Amendments appear to have been so little used that it is not possible to comment on their effectiveness. In only five states were postsecondary appeals reported, with mixed reults. Yet we believe that it is important to have an appeals mechanism available, and plan to suggest an improved system.

II. Problem Area: Relevant Vocational Education Emphasis

This area of concern relates to the appropriateness of funding priorities in terms of tomorrow's employment needs.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the 1968 Amendments

significantly broadened the traditional agriculture, trades and industry, and home economics emphasis of earlier vocational education legislation, establishing new priorities which emphasized contemporary and future job demands and training needs.

However, it appears to us that certain new priorities need to be established; while other priorities need reemphasis. Let me illustrate our concern.

1) The need for vocational education and guidance for older citizens has frequently gone unrecognized. The mid-career unemployed and underemployed and early retirees are two prominent examples.

2) Many newer, high-demand occupational groups, for example, health-related, service-related and newer technologies, have received inadequate funding emphasis.

3) The funding of programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped has been too low in many states.

4) Staff of many state vocational education agencies remains heavily oriented toward the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden emphases.

We need to insure that future funding allocations reflect employment demands of the future, rather than the past.

III. Problem Area: Adequate Program Guidance

We would call the Committee's attention to our concern that adequate program planning and development guidance be available to teachers and planners at postsecondary institutions.

Community colleges and technical institutes only rarely receive knowledgeable guidance from state vocational education agency personnel regarding occupational programs which have a specific, postsecondary focus, such as programs in law enforcement, human services, environmental sciences, transportation, etc. State agency personnel generally lack expertise in postsecondary occupational education.

A related area of concern is the difficulty encountered by institutions and state agencies in the development of an up-dated information base for wise vocational education decision-making. As has been noted in the recent Report of the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, "The difficulty, apparently, is not so much in the existence of data as in the problems of obtaining it in current accurate useful format." They commented on the frustration of educators "at the local level who cannot use Labor Department projections for vocational education planning because the categories DOL uses are incompatible with their own."

IV. Problem Area: Federal Administration of Programs

We are concerned about the administration of postsecondary occupational education programs at the federal level.

A substantial reorganization of the postsecondary occupational education delivery system had been promised under the Education Amendments of 1972. We had anticipated that this would result in a more equitable representation of community college interests among those agencies relating to postsecondary occupational education. That law created new staff positions which would provide opportunity to correct previous imbalances. To our knowledge only two present professional staff members in the entire U.S. Office of Education have had actual professional experience in community colleges (the Director of the Community College Unit and a sub-administrator in the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education).

To date we have observed little which has been encouraging. Two examples illustrate our concerns.

1) As of August 1, the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education has appointed two professionals to "supergrade" positions. However, despite their expertise, which we in no way wish to imply is inferior, neither of these persons has had professional experience in community colleges.

2) USOE's Community College Unit, despite its recent upgrading and the professional esteem given its director, Dr. Marie Martin, has no significant leverage to influence the direction of postsecondary occupational education. It has no program budget authority, virtually no staff and no impact on occupational education programs although the statute creating that Unit states:

> "Sec. 1072. (a) There is established, in the Office of Education, a Community College Unit (in this section referred to as the 'Unit') which shall have the responsibility for coordinating all programs administered by the Commissioner which affect, or can benfit community colleges, including such programs assisted under this Act, and the Vocational Education Act of 1963." (underlining added)

Needless to say, this obvious neglect in adhering to the provisions of the law disturbs those of us who are a part of the community college family.

In view of these problem areas and concerns we would now like to offer a series of recommendations, which, if incorporated in future legislation, will go a long way toward resolving these issues.

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

Dr. J. Harry Smith, President
Essex County Community College

Mr. Chairman, now that we have reviewed the present legislation, I wish to spend a few moments discussing the importance I personnally, as well as my community and junior college colleagues, attach to occupational education programs and services to the disadvantaged and the handicapped.

We applaud the Congress for its concern for disadvantaged and handicapped persons, as demonstrated by the setasides established in the 1968 Amendments. We hope that these funds reservations will be retained since they insure that there will be an emphasis on the needs of these persons in each state.

We would recommend two changes in these setasides.

1) The setasides for disadvantaged and handicapped should be combined into a single 25% reservation for persons with special needs. This would give the states greater flexibility in determining special needs and adjusting their funding patterns accordingly.

I would like to pause to comment that this recommendation is based on a number of reports from the states that the exact 10-15% division in current law sometimes poses problems for vocational educators, who may, for example, want to set up a new program for the handicapped, but find that if they do so they would exceed state allocations for programs for the handicapped. We were persuaded that a combined setaside would give the flexibility to make special efforts of this nature possible. I must confess that at the moment I am not sure how the new bilingual vocational education provisions in H.R. 69, which now are becoming law, will affect this recommendation. I can only say that for the present we will let this recommendation stand, while we consider the implications of the newly-enacted provisions.

2) A greater portion of these funds should be directed to the post-secondary level. At minimum, the postsecondary setaside should apply to these funds. As Dr. Masiko has already suggested, we believe the postsecondary setaside should have a much broader application throughout all the Vocational Education Act's Authorizations. AACJC's survey reports indicate that a <u>smaller</u> percentage of handicapped/disadvantaged funds go to post-secondary than from Part B generally.

(13% and 14%, respectively, as opposed to 20% Part B funds reported by the states providing the information).

I don't want to burden you with a sermon on the community college philosophy, but I do want to emphasize that our colleges are deeply committed to serving persons with special needs of all kinds including the disadvantaged and the handicapped. Not only are we "committed" to this service, but we are actively involved in it. We are trying hard, and we are doing a pretty good job.

Confining our thoughts to the disadvantaged for a moment, a significant point is that many persons over the age of 18 are "disadvantaged" because somehow they were not adequately educated in the elementary and secondary schools, if indeed they finished school at all. The Spanish-speaking Americans are particularly vulnerable here, with their linguistic barrier. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights estimates that in the Southwest, only 47% of the Mexican-American children entering school actually graduate from high school. The new bilingual vocational education authorizations are a recognition of the unique difficulties faced by Americans who are fluent in a language other than English.

High school dropouts and adults who are unemployed or underemployed are "disadvantaged" almost by definition, and an overwhelming portion of these individuals come from socio-economic situations which fit them into more formal definitions of economic or educational disadvantagement. As adults or near-adults, these individuals need adult vocational education opportunities, and experience indicates adults are more willing to attend an institution with older students, than be part of a "high school" environment.

Community and junior colleges offer these opportunities in abundance. Through guidance and counseling, remedial and basic education programs, pre-occupational and occupational training, as well as open admissions, accessibility, and recruitment efforts, community and junior colleges have served thousands of disadvantaged students.

A study done in 1971 by the National Planning Association[1] indicates that in the cities studied only 2.7% of all persons between 19 and 44 were in some kind of skill training, indicating a population waiting to be served if programs are available.

In that same year a greater number of 19-44 year old blacks received training in those cities at postsecondary institutions (mainly community colleges) including manpower skill training, than in other Department of Labor programs. (See Tab P) This is true although the percentages of blacks served are greater in the Department of Labor programs.

I might add that in the Southwest, without the community colleges there would be almost no postsecondary education opportunities, occupational or otherwise, for Chicanos.

---

1. Duplication, Gaps and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill Training Programs in 20 Cities, Vol. 1. Center for Priority Analysis, National Planning Association. (See Tab J)

What I am trying to say is that those persons who are disadvantaged or handicapped and who are of postsecondary school age have special needs. They may be unemployed or underemployed, they may lack basic skills for employability. They may have been "turned off" by traditional education. They may have dropped out of high school without learning a marketable skill. In the case of the handicapped, those of adult age need programs and services appropriate to their age, in places where their age-peers are served.

To conclude, the vocational education setaside for handicapped and disadvantaged is needed, and a larger percentage of such funding should be directed toward postsecondary occupational education.

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

Dr. John Grede, Vice Chancellor for Career and Manpower Programs
City Colleges of Chicago

Mr. Chairman, now that we have reviewed the present legislation, I will center my remarks around certain programs and services which we in the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges believe are particularly essential. AACJC believes that future legislation must establish and provide a broad range of programs and services for all citizens which are necessary for the creation and operation of readily available, high quality, future-oriented occupational and development opportunities.

We have spoken earlier of the need for flexibility in vocational education, so that these programs will address the challenges of the present and the future, rather than be tied to a backward view. I refer you to Tabs F, G and H to see the extensive programs in the City Colleges of Chicago and the State of Illinois, and the state's growth in postsecondary enrollments.

Program Authorizations

We see a current need for authorization for training programs in new and emerging service occupations, such as the following:

1) Paraprofessionals for new human services careers.

2) Upgrading of personnel employed with agencies and private service organizations working with offender rehabilitation, handicapped persons and the elderly.

3) Retraining of workers who are displaced from their careers due to retirement policies or technological change.

4) Technical manpower for energy resource research and production.

5) Provision of occupational and vocational education programs and services to persons in correctional institutions.

6) Training to strengthen employees of local governments.

7) Technical training to serve the manpower needs of industries undergoing rapid technological change and/or growth.

8) Short term preparation of personnel required to implement state and federal standards pertaining to industrial and trans-

portation safety, environmental regulation, consumer protection, and related priorities.

9) Authorization in future legislation should also provide for offering training and related instruction to volunteers engaged in public protection and emergency services. In addition to volunteer firemen for whom training programs are now allowed, such public service personnel as paramedics, emergency vehicle operators and related service workers need training. Particularly in rural and economically-depressed regions of our country, these skilled volunteers are necessary for the protection and well-being of our citizens.

Work Experience Programs

Programs which involve some form of work experience, cooperative education, work-study or other similar programs should be prominently featured in future legislation, combining present Parts G and H. Authority should be provided for training personnel to establish, coordinate and supervise such programs, and to provide student instruction related to the work or occupational experience; to reimburse the employers when necessary for certain added costs incurred in providing training through work experience and to pay for certain services such as transportation of students or other unusual costs that individual students may not reasonably be expected to assume while enrolled in such programs; to establish necessary procedures for cooperation with public and private employment agencies, labor groups, employers, and other community agencies in identifying suitable jobs for enrollees in work experience programs; for ancillary services and activities that assure quality in work experience programs, such as preservice and inservice training for teacher coordinators, supervisors, and development of cuuriculum materials; for participation of students enrolled in eligible private schools to the extent consistent with the numbers of such students in the area served; and for such placement and follow-up activities required to ascertain the impact of the program on the student, in the area labor market, and the economy.

Local or state education agencies should be authorized to provide employment when necessary to assist needy students to remain enrolled in occupational and vocational education, including those who are accepted for enrollment; to provide for work-study programs administered by the local education agency and to make them reasonably available, whether the school is in session or not, to all persons in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements for participation. This would be public employment, for the local education agency or some other public agency or institution.

Students employed in work-study programs should not, by reason of such employment, be considered employees of the United States, for any purpose.

Authority for Contracting and Cooperative Agreements

The provisions in current law for utilization of private resources

and developing of cooperative arrangements have been very useful. This authority should be continued.

We believe it should be a concern of public funding agencies to get maximum use of the public dollar. Wherever there is needless duplication of vocational education services there is accompanying waste, through unnecessary development of facilities, too-small classes for economical operation, absence of optimal opportunities for students, among other problems.

Every effort should be made to minimize duplication and encourage cooperation in order to develop an economical and effective mix of vocational education opportunities at the local level. This authority to use federal funds through cooperative arrangements will not, of itself, work miracles, but its presence in the law removes a possible blockage to such development while giving it implicit encouragement.[1]

Let me share with your at this time several examples of new trends in cooperative planning and programming which are emerging. Later Mr. Ensign, Vice President of the Husky Oil Company, will discuss a particularly promising cooperative model.

Dr. Frank Chambers, President of Middlesex County College, New Jersey, in a recent letter (Tab K) tells of a cooperative relationship he developed with Dr. Burr Coe, Superintendent of the Middlesex County Vocational-Technical school system.

> "In 1966, an MDTA funded welding shop was established in one of the county college buildings and was used by the vocational school for 2 years...This provided the vocational school system, which was cramped for space, with a facility at a minimal cost. It provided for utilization of space at the county college that was not then needed for a college program. The only significant disadvantage was its distance (about 7 miles) from the nearest vocational school.
>
> "We have also established a special admissions procedure for graduates of appropriate programs in the vocaitonal schools to related programs in the county college. This procedure includes waiver of the standard high school preparatory courses required of the usual high school graduate and substitutes solely the recommendation of the vocational graduate's guidance counselor."
>
> "Our Dean of Engineering Technologies serves on the Middlesex County Career Education Coordinating Council along with the Superintendent of the Vocational-Technical school system. This body seeks to coordinate career education offerings

---

1. "Articulation of Post-Secondary Programs in Occupational Education," Supra, See Tab E.

across the county and is becoming involved with the distribution of Vocational-Education Act funds to school systems within the county."

Dr. Chambers concludes:

"I consider the steps that we have taken to ensure cooperation between the two educational institutions to have been a most worthwhile undertaking. Similar steps, if applied on a most universal basis, would serve to prevent the overlaps in educational offerings between community colleges and area vocational schools that exist throughout the state and across the country. The resultant spirit of distrust and competition which develops as a result of a lack of such coordination can only cause harm to both the educational systems and to the interests of the communities which they serve."

Dr. Saul Orkin, Dean of Somerset County College (New Jersey) writes (Tab L) of a similar coooperative arrangement whereby his college and the local technical institute will jointly sponsor eight technology programs the fall.

He writes:

"It is too early to tell how this cooperative venture will work out but it appears obvious to us that substantial savings will be effected by the more efficient use of resources than could be accomplished if each institution pursued its own interests separately. If the spirit of cooperation that marks the beginning of this experiment is maintained, I feel strongly that the efforts that are being made in this County will serve as a landmark for cooperation among community colleges and technical institutions throughout the State."

In Illinois, President Alban E. Reid of Black Hawk College describes (Tab M) a successful cooperative program with local proprietary schools in which everyone seems to benefit. The students receive college credit for training received at proprietary schools. They are also eligible for state scholarships. The cost to students is lower than if they had enrolled directly in the proprietary school. The college benefits by gaining students who might have limited their training solely to courses offered at the proprietary schools. The proprietary schools benefit from evaluation by college staff and the increased status that is implied by the contractual arrangement with an accredited college. And, the taxpayer benefits by not having to support the establishment of duplicate training programs. Recent legislation in California permits the 99 Community Colleges to contract with private schools and colleges.

These are but three examples of new cooperative patterns we have begun to see emerge under the encouragement of VEA 1968.

Occupational Education Services

AACJC would also stress the importance of including adequate provision for essential occupational education services in future legislation.

1) Guidance and counseling services are our primary concern. These services include establishing and providing a broad range of career information, opportunities for vocational explorations, and rehabilitation counseling activities integrated through the curriculum, as well as specialized approaches to assist all individuals at all age levels in their career planning and in arranging for necessary educational experiences which will help achieve and adjust their career goals. Authorization is needed for developing and packaging materials for student, teacher and counselor to use in relating educational and occupational requirements and opportunities. Also, future authorizations should permit paying the cost of bringing employer and educational representatives to schools and colleges as well as transporting young people and adults to such sites to observe and explore educational and occupational opportunities and conditions.

It will be noted that this list includes a number of items which are a part of the "career education" concept, including career information and exploration and the infromation and guidance needed for informed career planning, from first career choice through the many changes and revisions which may come as the years go by.

This is needed for all persons, but particularly needed for persons with special needs, such as the disadvantaged and the handicapped. Here, outreach should be part of the package, to inform such persons of the availability of occupational training programs, and stimulate their interest and sense of potential capability.

2) Remedial education services should be an important part of the package, to help occupational education students overcome the deficiencies, if any, in their earlier education. Basic literacy and computational skills are indispensable in today's employment market.

3) Incentives for exchanges of personnel between public and private schools, agencies, and institutions, and with government, business, and industry. Such personnel exchanges can be an extremely effective form of communication between various groups, as well as a useful staff development device. For example, through such exchanges business and industry can better understand the capabilities of vocational and occupational education and advise on needed improvements in programs, while in turn, educators can keep up with developments in the "real world" for which they are providing vocational and occupational education.

4) Inservice teacher training and staff development programs should be authorized and provided where needed, for example, to improve teacher competency in professional fields, educational techniques, understanding of student needs, and learning of new job market trends.

5) Data acquisition, analysis and dissemination. Two vital components of this are labor market data in a form useful for occupational education planners, and follow-up studies on program graduates to test whether they are employed in an area related to their training. These two items are at the heart of accountability in vocational or occupational education, and the reason for the federal interest in giving it support. I have even seen it suggested that public funds be withheld from programs which train for occupations in which there is a surplus of available employees, and hence limited employment possibilities.[1] I would be willing to endorse this suggestion if there is a data base available to assist planners in making informed decisions.

6) Administration and supervision, including technical assistance. This would include assistance in utilizing the data mentioned above, in developing occupational education programs, and providing other needed information and services. We have complained above that in many cases state vocational education agencies lack the expert personnel to give this assistance to postsecondary schools, and repeat that complaint here. Perhaps calling the problem to the attention of this Committee will help bring about an improvement in the situation.

In this connection, we would recommend developmental activities for staffs of state and federal occupational education agencies to assist them to become acquainted with trends in community colleges and postsecondary occupational education.

Although we believe that these services are extremely important, they should be considered ancillary and supportive to occupational education programs. Therefore, we recommend that a limit of 20% of appropriated funds for all programs and services may be designated specifically for these administrative support services.

Special Projects for Improvement

AACJC strongly urges that those special projects related to promoting improvements and innovative experiments in vocational education which appear in the present legislation be retained and funded at least at present authorized levels.

Presently, these special projects are divided into three categories: Research and Training (Part C), Exemplary Programs and Projects (Part D), and Curriculum Development (Part I), each of which is separately funded. However, we believe that greater flexibility will result if the program funding for these categories is combined.

The Committee members may remember that in the recent report of the National and State Advisory Councils to this Committee it was noted that many state advisory councils recommended a similar consolidation.

Such a consolidated special projects emphasis should provide op-

---

1. Duplication, Gaps and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill Training Programs in 20 Cities. Vol. 1, Center for Priority Analysis, National Planning Association (See Tab I and J).

portunities for applied research which can address itself to the identification of new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for a variety of persons:

1. Young people who are still in school or who have left school either by graduation or by dropping out;

2. Adults who are in programs of occupational preparation beyond the secondary school;

3. Adults who are unemployed or who can be identified as underemployed.

We also see the need for the development of life-long occupational education models, such as a means of integrating short-term skill training into a career development continuum that extends throughout life. Much has been done in the realm of "career ladders" but a greater number and a wider variety of techniques applicable to specific situations needs to be developed.

Also, more work is needed in developing techniques for use of diversified media in occupational education.

Additionally, the projects should promote cooperation between public education and manpower agencies. They should enable the Deputy Commissioner and the Community College Unit to provide appropriate assistance to state and local educational agencies and community colleges in the development of curricula for new and changing occupations and to coordinate improvements in, and dissemination of, existing curriculum materials. Special projects for improvement should provide grants for the training or retraining of vocational education personnel through exchange programs, institutions and inservice education.

We urge consideration of this funding schedule: Fifty (50) percent of all funds should be allocated to each state for distribution to secondary and post-secondary institutions. We recommend that the remaining fifty (50) percent be divided equally between the Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education and the Director of the Community College Unit of USOE to enable them to make grants and contracts with state boards, institutions of higher education including community colleges, local educational agencies, and others, for projects to stimulate and assist the development, establishment and operation of programs or projects designed to carry out the purposes we have indicated above.

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

M. Dale Ensign, Vice President, Husky Oil Company

Mr. Chairman, I believe business and industry across the country will strongly support and participate in work study and cooperative educational programs, when they are challenged with an exciting idea and specific examples. I wish to share with the Committee our own experiences.

First, I wish to re-emphasize one of our recommendations stated earlier. We believe that combining funding for the Cooperative Vocational Education program, Part G, and the Work-Study program, Part H, will result in greater flexibility and freedom of operation for state planners. In the recent Report of the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, it was noted that several state advisory councils recommended consideration of such a consolidation.[1]

The Husky Oil Company has participated in an exciting experiment in cooperative education involving two school systems. I will highlight certain aspects of our venture.

Husky's program offered a practical introduction to all of the career opportunities available in the oil industry. The program took the form of an industrial-education consortium combining the resources of Husky, Northwest Community College and Cody (Wyoming) High School. A complete summary of our program is attached to this testimony. (Tab N)

Each institution and the Husky Oil Company played an integral part in the development and implementation of the program. The program was two-phased, combining a cooperative work effort with a one hour, early morning, related classroom experience entitled, "Introduction to Business." The course was under the supervision of Northwest Community College staff and taught by Husky Oil Company personnel, covering every phase of the Husky operation. Outside instructors were brought from the Company's Denver and Calgary offices. Outside instructors from the high school, American Telephone and Telegraph, Mountain Bell and Nielson Enterprises also participated. During the eleven week course, thirty-one instructors -- including the Chairman of the Board -- follow a barrel of oil through its various discovery and manufacturing states to its final consumption as a finished product: geology, production, refining, supply, distribution and marketing are among the aspects covered. To this was added all the administrative service departments necessary to any organization: accounting, communications, computers, legal, employee relations, etc.

1."The Impact of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968" prepared for Congressional Oversight Hearings, April, 1974, p. 3. (See Tab D),

The cooperative work experience placed students at work stations in accounting, production, data processing, and office services departments. Rotation after two weeks to a new work station enabled the students to learn in all four general areas. Three semester credits for the related class and two credit hours for the work experience were awarded for successful completion of the course.

How well did the program work? The consortium members asked the students and received excellent responses. One observed, "Being taught by those who are actually involved in professional business fields presented a much clearer picture to me and was more up-to-date than I could have learned in school." Another commented, "I liked the rotation of work experiences giving us an opportunity to work at a variety of jobs." A third advised,"I would like to see the program continued and expanded, allowing this year's students to return to concentrate or specialize in a particular area."

In explaining the creation of the program, the Chairman of the Board, Glenn E. Nielson, said, "The average high school graduate has little practical knowledge of the actual operations of business and industry. Too many of our high schools and colleges have the theory of education, but fail completely so far as practical knowledge or application is concerned. Industry has a responsibility and an obligation to provide education and insight for students planning careers in business." By designing this multifaceted program, administrations and faculties of both the industry and educational institutions have not only begun to meet this goal, but have made valuable contributions to their community as well. Millions of dollars in facilities, otherwise beyond the budgets of the schools, became accessible to the students. Cody High School broadened its curriculum and made it a more practical one by reinforcing academic education with career education. More importantly, human resources on all sides were made available. Husky was provided seasonal employment, with the promise of knowledgeable, experienced full-time help upon graduation. The students were taught by those responsible for the efficient functioning company about the inner workings of America's free enterprise system. In the process, they acquired the most beneficial kind of experience -- on-the-job training.

Such programs won't start themselves. It is up to those institutions that desire to form partnerships with business to make their presence felt. Industries of all kinds can look to the consortium experiment as an example of the service that can be rendered and the potentials they can realize by implementing a similar program.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is actively promoting the Husky program. Community college leaders are sponsoring workshops and publishing articles describing how similar programs can be set up and the resultant advantages to the student, the college, the businessman, and the taxpayer. This is practical, relevant and efficient vocational education at its best.

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

Ambassador John Mundt, Executive Director
Washington State Board for Community College Education

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Committee, I wish to expand upon some of our concerns regarding administration and planning for vocational and occupational education, and share with you our experiences in funding occupational education programs in the State of Washington. It may be a model which will prove viable in other areas of the country.

Appeals Procedures

We have mentioned earlier that our state directors reports indicate that there have been few appeals. This may be less a sign of satisfaction than of the lack of an appeals mechanism which promises effective hope of redress.

We would suggest that the Committee adopt language similar to that in H.R. 69 (Education Amendments of 1974, Sec. 805, amending Sec. 425 of the General Education Provisions Act) relating to appeals of aggrieved applicants under federal education programs. This right of appeal first to the state agency and if needed to the Commissioner of Education might be very helpful in some of the situations we have earlier related in which community colleges are rebuffed by the state vocational education agency. It is apparently not clear whether the above provision as written applies to vocational education. If not, a like provision should be included in the amendments now under consideration by this committee. We believe it might be wise to include the state advisory council more specifically in the appeal process. Upon appeals to the Commissioner the state advisory council might be requested by the Commissioner to conduct an independent investigation of the complaint.

State Advisory Councils

In reviewing experience across the country, it is our strong belief that the State Advisory Councils should more adequately represent post-secondary educational institutions and their students. Since community colleges and technical institutes enroll approximately 1.5 million students a year in occupational programs (and this figure is expected to increase), we believe that they should recieve greater representation than they do presently. At least one person who has responsbility for the direct supervision of a community college which has occupational, vocational or technical programs should be represented on a state council.

In our state a community college president and a community college trustee serve on the Advisory Council. Where a postsecondary, degree-granting technical institute system exists which is administered separately from the community college sytem, a representative from such an institution should be placed on the state council.

Local Advisory Councils

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges recommends that the Committee consider the establishment of local advisory councils on vocational education.

Improvements which have resulted from the establishment of National and State Advisory Councils suggest that similar benefits might accrue from the creation of Local Advisory Councils.

Local Advisory Councils would encourage the development of comprehensive local program planning in each community. These groups would be broadly representative and would represent labor, management, and every category of educational institution sponsoring occupational education, from elementary through postsecondary institutions. They would participate in the formation of local or area plans by developing recommendations to local planners, reviewing recommendations from occupational advisory committees, and reviewing the planning efforts before their transmittal to the appropriate state organizations for incorporation into the state plan.

Local advisory councils would provide a formalized mechanism through which the various parties to vocational and occupational education would have to get together. This might stimulate the development of a more useful data base on needs for vocational educaction and employment opportunities in the area. It could also promote cooperation among these parties and help prevent needless duplication of programs and facilities, as well as spotlight needed programs missing in a community, and groups not presently being served.

These councils should have connections, possibly through overlapping membership, with the Prime Sponsor Manpower Planning Councils under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. There are enough similarities between the purposes of the Vocational Education Act and of CETA that coordination between the two systems is needed. Comparable local vocational education councils would help promote this coordination.

State Administration: The Washington State Model

The State of Washington has developed a system for handling vocational education funds which works for us, and which may have application to other situations.

When the state's community college system was established in 1967, it was determined that the colleges would have their own state administrative agency and not be a part of the State Board of Education. The legislature anticipated that this might pose difficulties in the administration of vocational education, and solved that problem by establishing a Coordinating Council for Occupational Education.

This council, hereafter referred to as CCOE, has a nine-member Board, composed of three members from the community college system, three members from the State Board of Education, and three public members appointed by the Governor. The Superintendent of Public Instruction, who is chairman of the State Board of Education, and the Director of the State Board for Community College Education are non-voting members of the CCOE.

CCOE receives, disburses, and accounts for all federal vocational education funds; it gives final approval to the state plan and in general is where the "buck stops" in vocational education in the state. However, it has no direct operating responsibilities, except for a program in fire service training.

The State Board for Community College Education and the Superintendent for Public Instruction each make their own inputs into the state plan. This gives each level its own authority for plan development and determinining its own priorities, subject to final approval by CCOE.

Each of us, SPI and the SBCCE, has an interlocal agreement with CCOE with a clause that provides as follows:

> "In the development of the plan and in the development of the rules, regulations and policies by CCOE, the preparation by the State Board for Community College Education of their portion of the plan shall receive major consideration from CCOE in determining the direction and priorities within the plan."

A copy of our interlocal agreement is appended in Tab O.

CCOE allocates federal vocational education funds and transmits them to the appropriate agency for disbursal to schools and colleges. CCOE also reimburses the state community college board and the state education agency for their direct administrative costs. I might mention that the State of Washington has five vocational-technical institutes (compared to 27 community colleges) which are under the authority of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Under our system, funds for these vocational-technical institutes, though most of their students are postsecondary, flow through the Superintendent. This is still a somewhat untidy part of organizing for vocational education in our state, but discussions are underway between my office and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to solve this.

This system works pretty well. We had a problem for a few years in that the CCOE had its own staff to exercise program authority, especially in research and demonstration type projects. We often discovered that grants of which we had no knowledge, and which did not necessarily fit into our scheme of priorities, had been made to our colleges. This problem was partially solved this year in a revised interlocal agreement between our Board and the CCOE in which these additional functions were transferred to us (and to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for schools under his authority),

a portion of the CCOE's staff dispersed to SPI. Also all communications to the individual 27 colleges in the community college system flow to them from CCOE through SBCCE office.

In my view, the most significant elements of our state's system would be these: First, fund allocation decisions are not made by an agency in which the community colleges have no influence or impact. This gives them every chance for a "fair shake." At the same time, the various levels have to join together in one decision, which promotes knowledge of what the other level is trying to do, and hopefully, mutual understanding, cooperation, better articulation between K-12 and the community college system, and avoidance of unnecessary duplication.

Secondly, community college program decisions are made by community college people, who naturally have a better understanding of what the colleges can and hope to accomplish than do outsiders. Initial planning, up to the stage of final approval, is made by the community colleges themselves. Our Board has the staff for program approval and technical assistance in program development; additionally, it is responsible for student services, most teacher preparation, and the administration of personnel standards. We make use of part time coordinators in law enforcement, real estate courses, home and family life programs, and others, in order to hold permanent staffing levels down.

As for CCOE, in addition to its ultimate responsibility for vocational education in the state, it bears primary responsibility for planning for vocational education. It has developed a process for long range forecasting of manpower needs and of programs needed to meet these needs. We work closely with them in developing these projections, and we have found that it is very helpful to us in program planning and development.

This relatively successful structure for administration of vocational education in the State of Washington is outside the model usually thought of when reference is made to a single state agency as in the present Act. Although the Washington structure has been accepted by the U.S. Office of Education as being in compliance with the Act, I want to suggest in any new legislation that states be allowed sufficient flexibility in organization so that these types of structures will be permissable.

Although the major thrust of my comments has been on administration and planning for vocational education, I believe that sharing with the Committee the experience in Washington relative to the disadvantaged might be helpful in reinforcing the presentations made by my colleagues Dr. J. Harry Smith and Dr. John Grede. It is very difficult to serve students suffering economic handicaps under the present act. This is because none of the funds can be used to pay tuition for the students or to provide other direct financial aid. The work-study Part H funds are not of assistance to many of the economically handicapped in the community colleges. The limiting age of 21 excludes 67% of the Washington community college students from participation, the earning limits of $350 per academic year are inadequate for an adult who is self-supporting and may have dependents, and the appropriation has been inad-

equate.

Therefore access to the occupational education necessary for any kind of upward mobility is denied to the poor unskilled adult -- the person who needs access the most. In any new legislation I would recommend that age restrictions be removed, that students in need be allowed work-study earnings up to the level equal to the unemployment compensation of the state, and that the appropriation authorization be increased for postsecondary students in work-study programs. It would be helpful if funds could be used to pay required tuition for the economically handicapped.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT

Dr. J. Harry Smith, President

Essex County Community College

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to summarize the recommendations my colleagues and I have made. Dr. Masiko will then conclude our presentation with some thoughts on alternatives to the present state delivery system.

I believe that the recommendations we have made could be encompassed in the following ten points. We hope that the Committee will give these ideas careful consideration as it develops new vocational education legislation.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1) The level of funding for postsecondary occupational education programs should be increased to a minimum of 40% to 60% of total funds.

2) We believe it is time to consider new delivery system alternatives for the distribution of vocational education funds to all state institutions which will be more equitable and appropriate. Although we are not ready at the present time to recommend one system, we will offer several possible alternatives which may help the Committee revamp the present system.

3) New vocational emphases should be built into the legislation to encourage the funding of programs for early retirees and older citizens who are disadvantaged, such as the mid-career unemployed and underemployed persons whose job skills are obsolete.

4) There is need for greater focus on training for occupations of the future, rather than the past. Newer occupational areas -- human services, health-related, service industries, technologies -- need greater funding emphasis. Flexibility should be built into vocational education planning to permit adaptation to future needs in a repidly changing society. At the present time more than 70% of the work force is in the service industries -- health, hospitality, data processing, etc. However, this may change and programs should be ready to change as occupational patterns change.

5) Provision should be made for more rigorous state plan review in the U.S. Office of Education to ensure that Federal priorities are indeed implemented in the states. The Community College Unit should be given the authority to review and comment on, or possibly even to recommend rejection of, state plans for postsecondary occupational education.

6) To create greater flexibility and freedom of operation for state planners, we recommend the combination of certain of the current categories of the Vocational Education Act:

A. Combine funding for Part C (Research and Training), Part D (Exemplary Programs and Projects) and Part I (Curriculum Development), all of which are related to improvement and innovation of vocational education. The category could be identified as "Improvement of Vocational Education". In order to encourage national and regional improvements, the 50% set-

aside to the Commissioner should be retained. Of that part, half should be devoted to postsecondary occupational education, and administered by the Community College Unit of the U. S. Office of Education.

B. Combine funding for Part G (Cooperative Vocational Education) and Part H (Work-Study), both of which are closely related in activity. This category could be identified as "Work Experience". Funds should be distributed equitably between secondary and postsecondary students.

C. The setasides for vocational education programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped should be combined to allow greater flexibility at a combined minimum of 25%.

7) We recommend that the Congress take a look at state vocational agency staff composition to make sure that a proportionate number of persons employed by these agencies have professional experience and expertise in postsecondary occupational education. If it is determined that these agencies will retain sole authority over Federal vocational education in the states, it is essential that they become more responsive to needs and problems at this level. Specifically, we believe that persons with community college experience are needed in the state agencies.

8) We urge that appropriate steps be taken to ensure that postsecondary occupational education institutions and community colleges are adequately and meaningfully represented on State Advisory Councils.

9) We recommend that Congress consider establishing Local Advisory Councils to augment the responsibilities of State and National Councils.

10) Because we believe that too much Federal vocational education money goes for administration in some states, we recommend that Congress establish an upper limit on the amount of the Federal grant that can be spent for state administration.

We would further comment that AACJC believes that full funding and implementation of Title X, Parts A and B, of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) would facilitate and strengthen many provisions of the Vocational Education Act.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS BY DR. MASIKO

Mr. Chairman, we have endeavored to give the Committee a perspective on community and junior colleges - what they are and are trying to achieve, and what they view as their role in occupational education.

We have also tried to analyze the current Vocational Education Act in terms of the ways in which it helps or hinders the achievement of community college objectives.

We have offered suggestions of changes in the Act which we believe would lead to significant improvements in postsecondary occupational education. I will not repeat them all, but wish to stress again our belief that the postsecondary level is of such importance to total vocational education delivery in this country that the setaside should be increased, to a minimum of 40 to 60% of total funds.

Finally, I would like to spend a few moments discussing state administration of vocational education. I have earlier spoken of our numerous concerns regarding the inequitable administration of postsecondary occupational educational programs in many states. In order to solve these problems, we believe basic revisions of the administration of vocational and occupational education at the state level may be in order.

It is time to consider new delivery system alternatives for the distribution of vocational education funds to institutions on a basis which will be more equitable and appropriate. The present system is not working in many states. We believe that serious consideration should be given to restricting the authority of the present "State Boards" solely to elementary and secondary vocational education. A new agency or another more appropriate agency, might better have responsibility for administering postsecondary occupational education.

At this time we are not ready to recommend a specific system, in the main because we find such variations in the needs of the 50 states - and no one pattern seems wise. We hope to propose a system that would have flexibility to permit a variety of options for the individual states. At this point in time we only intend to initiate a constructive discussion by suggesting three alternative delivery systems.

1. A first alternative delivery system is postulated on the complete separation of funding for all programs both at the national and state levels. Elementary and secondary vocational education programs would continue to be funded by present agencies. However, postsecondary occupational education programs would be funded through separate agencies. At the national level the postsecondary funding agency would be the Community College Unit in the U.S. Office of Education.

At the state level the postsecondary funding agency would be either an existing agency or a separate agency created to give policy direction to the postsecondary institutions in the state. Representatives of all types of institutions offering postsecondary occupational education programs

in the state would be represented on such an agency.

2. Another alternative, if no structural changes are to be made, would be to maintain the present system of administration but to raise the setaside for postsecondary occupational education to 60 per centum (in line with the allotment of federal funds). This policy has been in effect in Wisconsin for many years.

In this case, the existing state agencies for vocational education should be required to alter the composition of their staff, if needed, to ensure that an adequate proportion of total state agency staff have the expertise to give leadership to programs in postsecondary occupational education.

3. Finally, my colleague Mr. Mundt has described a system which works in his state and merits consideration for national adaptation. Funds go to a Coordinating Council composed of elementary-secondary, postsecondary and public members, which makes determinations on the distribution of funds in the state and has ultimate responsibility for the state plan and its implementation. However, as Mr. Mundt described, the direct planning inputs and implementation responsibility are carried out by agencies responsible for the level of education involved.

We wish to thank the committee and its distinguished Chairman for the privilege of sharing our considered opinions on the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. We stand ready to assist the Committee in the months ahead as it continues its deliberations, endeavoring to improve and update this fine legislation.

EXHIBITS

(Attached to the Testimony given the Committee)

TAB

A "After the Boom...What Now for Community Colleges?", by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., reprinted from December/January 1974 Community and Junior College Journal.

B "Beyond the Open Door...The Open College", by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., reprinted from the August/September 1974 Community and Junior College Journal.

C Distribution of vocational education funds to postsecondary level, "Vocational Education Information No. V", U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education. Fiscal Year 1972.

D Digest of 2-Volume "Reports on the Implementation of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968", General Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, November 1973.

E "Articulation of Post-Secondary Programs in Occupational Education, E.B. Moore, Jr., Nathaniel D. Smith, and E.L. Kurth. A Publication of the Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida State University, University of Florida. November 1973.

F "Career Education at Illinois Public Community Colleges", by John J. Swalec and Fitcher Weathington, Community College Bulletin, March 1974.

G "Enrollment in Illinois Community College Occupational Programs, Fall 1973", Illinois Community College Board.

H City Colleges of Chicago: Occupational Programs by Divisions

I Letter from Calvin Dellefield, Executive Director, National Advisory Council on Vocational Education; memo describing contents of "Duplication, Gaps and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill Training Programs in 20 Cities: Volume I, Research Report", a study conducted by the Center for Priority Analysis, National Planning Association.

J. Ibid. Highlights of the Study.

K Letter from Dr. Frank Chambers, President, Middlesex County College, Edison, New Jersey

L Letter from Saul Orkin, Dean of the College, Somerset County College, Somerville, New Jersey

M Memo to Dr. Alban E. Reid, President, Black Hawk College, Moline, Illinois, on "Cooperation between Black Hawk College and Local Proprietary Schools"

N "Husky Oil's Summer School and Work Program," Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

O Letter from John C. Mundt, Director, State Board for Community College Education, State of Washington; Copy of "Interlocal Cooperative Agreement"

P Manpower Training in Community Colleges, by Andrew S. Korim. AACJC Publication, 1974

AACJC COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 11 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Chairman

Dr. Leslie Koltai
Chancellor-Superintendent
Los Angeles Community College District
California

Members

Dr. Clyde Blocker, President
Harrisburg Area Community College
Pennsylvania

Dr. Maceo T. Bowie, President
Kennedy-King College, Illinois

Dr. Candido de Leon, President
Hostos Community College, New York

Dr. Gilberto de los Santos, Dean
El Paso Community College, Texas

Dr. Harry Downs, President
Clayton Junior College, Georgia

Mr. Henrik N. Dullea
Assistant Deputy to the Chancellor
for Community Colleges, New York

Mrs. Lilyan Eldred, Trustee
Monterey Peninsula College
California

Mr. M. Dale Ensign, Vice President
Husky Oil Company, Washington, D.C.

Dr. William Hayes, President
Alice Lloyd College, Kentucky

Dr. John B. Hirt, President
Community College of Allegheny County
Pennsylvania

Mr. B.A. Jensen, President
Association of Community College
Trustees, Iowa

Mr. John Mundt, Executive Director
State Board for Community College
Education, Washington

Dr. Laban Peachey, President
Hesston College, Kansas

Mr. George E. Potter, Trustee
Jackson Community College
Michigan

Dr. J. Harry Smith, President
Essex County College, New Jersey

Dr. Thomas M. Spencer, President
San Jacinto College, Texas

Mr. Sedley Stuart, Trustee
Mt. Hood Community College
Oregon

Dr. Harold T. White, President
Northeast Mississippi Junior
College, Mississippi

Dr. Kenneth Wright, Director
Community College Program
New Jersey

Ex-Officio

Mr. William Meardy, Executive Director
Association of Community College Trustees
Washington

Governmental Affairs Staff

John E. Tirrell, Vice President

Claire T. Olson, Associate Director

Sandy I. Morton, Secretary